

<i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i>		Application No. 10/813,252 Examiner MELVIN H. POLLACK	Applicant(s) DOSHI ET AL. Art Unit 2445
--	--	--	--

All Participants:

(1) MELVIN H. POLLACK.

(2) Jenni Moen (52,038).

Date of Interview: 17 December 2009

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Status of Application: allowance

(3) _____.
 (4) _____

Time: 2:00 PM EST

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
101 - potential signals per se

Claims discussed:
9

Prior art documents discussed:
Specification, Pp. 4-5

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/M. H. P./
 Examiner, Art Unit 2445

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Possible for claim 9, in light of Pp. 4-5 of the specification, to be construed as signals per se or carrier wave when given their broadest reasonable interpretation. Applicant has gone on record to clarify that this is not the case. Examiners amendment adding non-transitory (tangible) medium will clarify that claim 9 is not drawn towards a carrier wave.